

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 3, 4, 11, 18, 20, 27, and 35 have been canceled herein without prejudice. Claims 1, 8, 9, 16, 17, 19, 24 to 26, 32, and 33 have been amended (strikeouts and brackets indicating deleted text and underlining indicating added text). No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 2, 5 to 10, 12 to 17, 19, 21 to 26, and 28 to 34 are now pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Objection to Claim 24

Claim 24 has been amended herein without prejudice to correct its dependency, thereby rendering moot the present objection. Approval and entry, and withdrawal of the present objection, are respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 1 to 6, 8 to 14, 16, 17, 19 to 22, 24 to 30, and 32 to 35 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1 to 6, 8 to 14, 16, 17, 19 to 22, 24 to 30, and 32 to 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0133546 (“the Oni reference”) and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0061482 (“the Emmerichs reference”). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of the Oni and Emmerichs references does not render unpatentable these claims, and the present rejection should be withdrawn, at least for the following reasons.

As an initial matter, claims 3, 4, 11, 20, 27, and 35 have been canceled herein without prejudice, thereby rendering moot the present rejection with respect to those claims.

As for the remaining claims, to reject a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Office bears the initial burden of presenting a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *In re Rijekaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 1532, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993). To establish *prima facie* obviousness, three criteria must be satisfied. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify or combine reference teachings. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). This teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination must be found in the prior art and not based on the application disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). As clearly indicated by the Supreme Court, it is “important to identify a reason that would have prompted a person of

ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the [prior art] elements” in the manner claimed. *See KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007). In this regard, the Supreme Court further noted that “rejections on obviousness cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.” *Id.*, at 1396. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. *In re Merck & Co., Inc.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 U.S.P.Q. 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Third, the prior art reference(s) must teach or suggest all of the claim features. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974). As explained herein, the Office Action does satisfy these requirements as to all of the features of the claims.

Independent claim 1 relates to a method of managing visibility of GUI components in an application, and, as herein amended without prejudice,¹ provides, *inter alia*, the following:

for displaying a user interface screen of the application
according to an applied one of the plurality of profiles:
 initializing the application, wherein the initializing includes:
 starting the application; and
 building the user interface screen of the application with
 all of the GUI components set as visible;
 invoking the visibility manager to:
 determine, based on the selected visibility states of the
 applied profile, which of the GUI components of the built
 interface are to be set as not visible; and
 revise the built user interface screen based on the
 determination; and
 displaying the revised user interface screen of the
application.

With respect to canceled claims 3 and 4, the Office Action refers to pars. 62 to 65 of the Oni reference as assertedly disclosing initially building a user interface that includes all GUI components set as visible and subsequently revising the user interface based on a profile for display of the user interface in accordance with a profile. The cited section merely indicates that a user profile may dynamically change and that user interfaces displayed over time may differ based on the changes to the profile. However, the changes

¹ Claim 1 has been amended to include features of canceled claims 3 and 4, and the arguments presented below apply equally to canceled claim 4. Accordingly, the amendments to the claim do not raise new issues that require a new search. Approval and entry of the amendments to the claim are therefore respectfully requested. However, it is noted that, even should the Examiner decline to enter the amendments, the Examiner should still indicate whether the proposed amendments would place the claims in better condition for allowance and/or in better condition for appeal, e.g., in view of the cited references. M.P.E.P. § 714.13(III).

are not to a generated interface, but rather between interfaces generated at different times, *i.e.*, each interface generation via a separate instantiation of an interface generation method for generation of a new interface and each generated for a different profile – the profile before it is changed and the profile after it is changed. The Oni reference does not disclose or suggest an interface generation method that includes, for a particular display of a particular interface according to an applied profile, initially generating an interface with all GUI components set as visible and then revising the generated interface according to a profile. The Emmerichs reference is not relied upon for correcting, and indeed does not correct, this critical deficiency of the Oni reference.

Therefore, the combination of the Oni and Emmerichs references does not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim, so that the combination of the Oni and Emmerichs reference does not render unpatentable claim 1 or any of its dependent claims, *e.g.*, claims 2, 5, 6, and 8.

Claim 9, as herein amended without prejudice, includes subject matter analogous to that of claim 1. Claim 9 and its dependent claims, *e.g.*, claims 10, 12 to 14, and 16, are therefore allowable for essentially the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 17, as herein amended without prejudice, includes subject matter analogous to that of claim 1. Claim 17 and its dependent claims, *e.g.*, claims 19, 21, 22, and 24, are therefore allowable for essentially the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 25, as herein amended without prejudice, includes subject matter analogous to that of claim 1. Claim 25 and its dependent claims, *e.g.*, claims 26, 28 to 30, and 32, are therefore allowable for essentially the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 33, as herein amended without prejudice, includes subject matter analogous to that of claim 1. Claim 33 and its dependent claim 34 are therefore allowable for essentially the same reasons as claim 1.

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claims 7, 15, 23, and 31 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7, 15, 23, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of the Oni reference, the Emmerichs reference, and U.S. Patent No. 6,476,833 ("the Moshfeghi reference"). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of the Oni, Emmerichs, and Moshfeghi references does not render unpatentable these claims, and the present rejection should be withdrawn, at least for the following reasons.

Claims 7, 15, 23, and 31 ultimately depend from claims 1, 9, 17, and 25, respectively, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims, since the secondary Moshfeghi reference does not correct the critical deficiencies noted above with respect to the Oni and Emmerichs references. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (any dependent claim that depends from a non-obvious independent claim is non-obvious).

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection is therefore respectfully requested.


V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that any outstanding objections and rejections of the claims should be withdrawn. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Although not believed necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: February 7, 2008

By: 
Aaron Grunberger
Reg. No. 59,210

One Broadway
New York, NY 10004
Telephone: (212) 425-7200

U.S. Pat. Appl. Ser. No. 10/826,723
Attorney Docket No. 11884/502501
Reply to Final Office Action of November 14, 2007

CUSTOMER NO. 53000